

Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 COPENH 02678 211332Z

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00
CIAE-00 PM-05 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 PA-02
SP-02 SS-15 ACDA-12 TRSE-00 OMB-01 NRC-07 /072 W
-----127275 211334Z /43

O 211208Z APR 78

FM AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2678

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

AMEMBASSY LISBON

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG

USMISSION USNATO

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY REYKJAVIK

AMEMBASSY ROME

USCINCEUR IMMEDIATE

USNMR IMMEDIATE

USLOSACLANT IMMEDIATE

USICA WASHDC

UNCLAS COPENHAGEN 2678

USNMR FOR POLAD

39 11652: NA

TAGS: MNUC SOPN PDIP NATO DA

SUBJ: SECDEF BROWN'S INTERVIEW WITH DANISH TV

REF: COPENHABEN 2658, COPENHAGEN 2677

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 COPENH 02678 211332Z

AS PROMISED IN COPENHAGEN 2677 AND FOLLOWING GOLDSMITH-RYAN
TELECON, FULL TEXT OF SECDEF'S INTERVIEW ON DANISH TV IS TRANS-
MITTED. INTRODUCTION BY DANISH TV COMMENTATOR LONE KUHLMANN
EXPLAINED BACKGROUND OF NPG MEETING, LISTED PARTICIPANTS
REFERRED TO SUBJECTS DISCUSSED, AND OFFERED BRIEF BIO ON SECDEF.
TEXT FOLLOW:

QTE

Q: SECRETARY, IN UNDERSTAND THAT THE MEETING AMONG OTHER THINGS DISCUSSED THE MODERNIZATION OF NATO'S NUCLEAR FORCE UP TO THE LATE 80'S AND EARLY 90'S. WAS THAT IN FACT A SORT OF SHOPPING LIST?

A: NO, AT EACH OF THESE NUCLEAR PLANNING GROUP MEETINGS, WE DO DISCUSS THE QUESTION OF THE BALANCE IN NUCLEAR FORCES, INCLUDING THEATER NUCLEAR FORCES AND ALSO THE FUTURE BALANCE. AS WE LOOK AT THE FUTURE BALANCE OF COURSE, WE EXAMINE WHAT MODERNIZATION IS LIKELY TO BE MADE AND SHOULD BE MADE IN NATO'S NUCLEAR FORCES, AND WHAT WE ESTIMATE THE MODERNIZATION WILL BE THAT WILL TAKE PLACE IN WARSAW PACT NUCLEAR FORCES. AS YOU LOOK AT THE NEAR TERM, YOU CAN BE RATHER PRECISE, AS WERE WITH THE MODERNIZATION OF THE SYSTEMS FOR THE LANCE SHORT-RANGE MISSILE AND FOR THE 8-INCH ARTILLERY SHELL. AS YOU LOOK FURTHER AHEAD, THE FUTURE HAS LESS CERTAINTY. ALTHOUGH I WOULD NOT CALL THAT A SHOPPING LIST, I WOULD SAY THAT IS WAS MUCH MORE OPEN AS TO DECISIONS.

Q: I UNDERSTAND THE NEUTRON BOMB, THE MUCH TALKED-ABOUT NEUTRON BOMB, WAS NOT ON THE AGENDA EXACTLY, BUT CAN YOU TALK ABOUT THE FUTURE WITHOUT MENTIONING THE NEUTRON BOMB?

A: YES, I THINK YOU CAN. THE NEUTRON BOMB, THE SO-CALLED ENHANCED RADIATION/REDUCED BLAST WEAPON, WHICH REDUCES COLLATERAL EFFECTS, CASUALTIES TO NEARBY FRIENDLY FORCES OR CIVILIANS, OR WOULD IF IT IS PRODUCED AND DEPLOYED, IS ONE OF A NUMBER OF POSSIBLE MODERNIZATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS IN NUCLEAR FORCES. IT IS ONE OF VALUE BUT IT IS NOT THE ONLY ONE AND NOT THE ONLY ONE OF IMPORTANCE. AS YOU SAY, THE ER UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 COPENH 02678 211332Z

WEAPON WAS NOT ON THE AGENDA. IT WAS REFERRED TO IN PASSING BY A NUMBER OF MINISTERS PRESENT, AND I DID REPEAT FOR THEM THE DECISION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE U TO DEFER DECISION ON PRODUCTION OF ER WEAPONS FOR THE TIME BEING. WE WILL GO AHEAD WITH MODERNIZATION OF SOME OF OUR TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND MAKE ARRANGEMENTS SO THAT THE ER FEATURE COULD BE ADDED AT A LATER TIME IF SUCH A DECISION WAS MADE. THE DECISION WILL DEPEND - ONE OF THE FACTORS IN THE DECISION, A MAJOR FACTOR IN THE DECISION-WILL BE WHETHER AND HOW THE SOVIET UNION RESPONDS IN TERMS OF LIMITING ITS OWN CONVENTIONAL AND NUCLEAR FORCES THAT ARE DIRECTED AGAINST NATO, SINCE THESE ARE THE FORCES THAT THE PRODUCTION AND THE DEPLOYMENT OF AN ER WEAPON WOULD BE INTENDED TO OFFSET.

Q: A SORT OF TRADE MAYBE?

A: YES, I THINK ITS NOT POSSIBLE TO BE VERY SPECIFIC ABOUT WHAT A TRADE MIGHT BE, BUT THERE ARE A NUMBER OF POSSIBILITIES. CERTAINLY, THE SS-20 WHICH IS A MOBILE INTERMEDIATE RANGE BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM WHICH THE SOVIETS ARE NOW BEGINNING TO DEPLOY AND WHICH WE ANTICIPATE WILL BE DEPLOYED IN LARGE NUMBERS. IT CAN REACH ALL OF WESTERN EUROPE AND CAN REACH IT NOT WITH TACTICAL WEAPONS BUT WITH - NOT WITH WEAPONS THAT YIELD A KILOTON BUT WITH WEAPONS THAT ARE OF MEGATON YIELD AND CAN DESTROY WHOLE CITIES. THAT IS A MAJOR THREAT AND IT OUGHT TO BE A MAJOR CONCERN. I THINK IT IS A MAJOR CONCERN

AMONG PEOPLE WHO ARE INFORMED ABOUT IT, AND THATS SOMETHING THE SOVIETS

COULD SHOW RESTRAINT IN. IT REMAINS TO BE SEEN WHETHER THEY WILL. ANOTHER IS SOVIET TANK DEPLOYMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN INCREASING ON THEIR SIDE OF THE LINE BETWEEN NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT ANFAGAIN POSE A VERY SUBSTANTIAL THREAT TO ALL THE NATO COUNTRIES.

Q: YOU YOURSELF ARE A PHYSICIST AND AS SUCH ARE MUCH BETTER EQUIPPED THAN THE REST OF US TO JUDGE ABOUT THE TECHNOLOGICAL THINGS LIKE THE NEUTRON BOMB, AND I UNDERSTAND YOU SUPPORT THE DEPLOYMENT.

A: I AM A PHYSICIST BY TRAINING. I AM NOW A GOVT OFFICIAL AND I HAVE TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT FAR MORE THAN THE NUCLEAR PHYSICS OF A SPECIFIC DECISIONS. MY VIEW ON THE ER IS THAT FROM A MILITARY PERSPECTIVE, THE NATO ALLIANCE NEEDS TO OFFSET SOME OF THE STEPS THAT THE WARSAW PACT NATIONS HAVE TAKEN TO INCREASE THE WARSAW PACT CAPABILITY.
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 COPENH 02678 211332Z

THE ER WEAPON IS ONE WAY TO DO THIS IN A COST EFFECTIVE WAY AND, THEREFORE, FROM A MILITARY POINT OF VIEW, IT MAKES SENSE AS AN IMPROVEMENT AND THAT'S WHAT I'VE BEEN SAYING AND I CONTINUE TO SAY. AT THE SAME TIME I RECOGNIZE THERE ARE OTHER FACTORS-THERE ARE POLITICAL FACTORS. THOSE ARE VERY IMPORTANT AND THOSE IN FACT HAVE TO BE IN THE END THE DETERMINANTS OF THE DECISION.

Q: I WAS GOING TO SAY THAT NATO OFFICIALS AT THIS MEETING AND AT OTHER MEETINGS HAVE GIVEN THE IMPRESSION THAT THE MARKETING BY THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT OF THE NEUTRON BOMB IS WHAT THEY'VE TERMED A DISASTER IN PUBLIC RELATIONS. WOULD YOU SUPPORT THAT VIEW?

Q: WELL, IF THAT'S INTENDED TO MEAN THAT WE HAVE BEEN POOR SALESMEN, I THINK IT'S CORRECT. WE HAVEN'T TRIED TO BE SALESMEN AT ALL. WE ARE TRYING TO TELL THE ALLIANCE WHAT WE THINK IS AVAILABLE. IT'S UP TO OTHER ALLIANCE MEMBERS TO DECIDE ON WHAT'S APPROPRIATE FOR THE ALLIANCE TO DO IN THE WAY OF DEPLOYMENT, ALTHOUGH THE DECISION ON PRODUCTION IS CLEARLY A DECISION FOR THE US. THE ER WEAPON WAS INCORRECTLY PICTURED FROM THE BEGINNING. IT WAS DESCRIBED IN TERMS THAT FANNED POLITICAL ENMITIES, AND I DON'T THINK THE PUBLIC DID UNDERSTAND WHAT ITS ADVANTAGE AND LIMITATIONS WERE. WE FAILED TO GET ACROSS RIGHT FROM THE BEGINNING AN ACCURATE UNDERSTANDING ON THE PART OF THE PUBLIC AS TO WHAT ER WAS, AND I THINK THAT WAS THE PLACE WHERE US OFFICIALS DID NOT DO VERY WELL. NOW THAT WAS NOT IN THE LAST TWO MONTHS; THAT WAS ALMOST A YEAR AGO.

Q: SO THE BOMB IN FACT WAS GOOD ENOUGH, BUT THE SALES TECHNIQUE WAS BAD?

A: NO, I DON'T THINK THE BOMB WAS EITHER GOOD OR BAD. IT'S HOW PEOPLE USE THINGS, AND WHETHER THEY SUCCEED IN AVOIDING WARS BY HAVING WEAPONS OR WHETHER THEY LET WEAPONS DRAG THEM INTO WARS THAT DETERMINES WHETHER THEY ARE GOOD OR NOT. THE FAILURE WAS A FAILURE OF THE MEDIA, FIRST IN THE US AND THEN IN EUROPE, CORRECTLY TO DESCRIBE THE FACTS, AND THE GOVERNMENTAL FAILURE, IN WHICH I PARTICIPATED, WAS TO SEE TO IT THAT THE PUBLIC, NEVERTHELESS, DID UNDERSTAND THE FACTS AND TO ASSURE THAT THE PUBLIC UNDERSTOOD
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 COPENH 02678 211332Z

THEM. THANK YOU
END QTE
DEAN

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, TEXT, PRESS CONFERENCES, MILITARY CAPABILITIES, NUCLEAR WEAPONS, MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 21 apr 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 jan 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978COPENH02678
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780171-0134
Format: TEL
From: COPENHAGEN
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780432/aaaabawr.tel
Line Count: 178
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 3f24efa9-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 78 COPENHAGEN 2658, 78 COPENHAGEN 2677
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 mar 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2896326
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: SECDEF BROWN'S INTERVIEW WITH DANISH TV
TAGS: MNUC, SOPN, PDIP, DA, US, NATO, (BROWN, HAROLD)
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/3f24efa9-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014